

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 11, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-23, 25 and 27-29 remain in this application, where claims 11, 19, 24 and 26 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications. Independent claims 1, 16 and 22 have been amended to include features similar to that of canceled claims 11 and 26.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 19 for a certain informality. Applicant respectfully traverses, however to advance prosecution, claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice. The cancellation of claim 19 renders moot this objection with regard to claim 19.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims

22, 24-25 and 27 for a certain informality. Applicant respectfully traverses, however to advance prosecution, claim 26 has been canceled and claims 22, 25 and 27 have been amended to remove the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 22, 24-25 and 27 is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-14 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,186,659 (Hefner) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0004828 (Chernick). Further, claims 5, 15 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hefner in view of Chernick and U.S. Patent No. 6,203,174 (Plumeyer). Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hefner in view of Chernick and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0264187 (Vanderschuit). Claims 11 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hefner in view of Chernick and U.S. Patent No. 5,072,341 (Huang). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-23, 25 and 27-29, as amended, are patentable over Hefner, Chernick, Plumeyer, Vanderschuit and Huang for at least the following reasons.

On page 8 of the Final Office Action, in rejecting claims 1

and 26, the Examiner correctly noted that Hefner and Chernick do not disclose or suggest that the protruding elements comprises a hinge. Huang is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Hefner and Chernick.

Huang is directed to a lamp assembly suspended from a ceiling fan. FIG 6 shows an elongated fluorescent lamp 40 along with a reflection lamp shield 30 being movable by a rotary member 20. As clearly shown in FIG 6, the rotary member 20 is located at one end of the lamp/lamp shield 40, 30.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 16 and 22, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein each protruding element of the plurality of protruding elements comprises a hinge that enables the protruding element to rotate around at least one axis tangential to the housing, the hinge being located between ends of the protruding element.

A hinge being located between ends of a protruding element is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Huang, Hefner and Chernick, alone or in combination. Rather, Huang merely discloses a rotary member


20 located at an end of a lamp shield 30. Plumeyer and Vanderschuit are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Hefner, Chernick and Huang.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 16 and 22 is allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-21, 23, 25 and 27-29 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1, 16 and 22.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
February 2, 2009

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101